

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,306	11/09/2000	Kazue Sako	14051	5037
23389 75	590 11/25/2003		EXAM	INER
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA			ABDI, KAMBIZ	
GARDEN CITY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3621	
			DATE MAILED: 11/25/200	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

te .			. 1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
Advisory Action	09/710,306	SAKO, KAZUE	8
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kambiz Abdi	3621	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 07 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to h places the application	a in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the ender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officially filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriation	ite extension e action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 	•		
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplif	ying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ame	endment
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT pla	ace the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY	o issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
0. Other:		JOHN W. HAYES	,
	PF	JOHN W. HAYES	
	i /		





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The argument put forward by the applicant has not placed the claimed invention in the condition for allowance. The argument put forward is not substantially different than what was argued in the last amendment filed by the applicant on 8 May 2003. The applicant argument is directed at he alleged difference that is "without communication with a remote center." and the prior art of record Lee. It is clear that Lee reference does not communicate with a central authority once the vault (PCMCI card) is present which contains all the elements the applicant has pointed out in the claim. What is described in the applicant's argument, as a distinguishing element is clearly identical to the Lee reference as one can observe by reviewing the applicant's figures 3 and 4 in the application and the specification. The two figures clearly disclose presence of IC cards, PCs and the relationship between revenue generating stamp system and the component discussed in the Lee system. Therefore the examiner disagrees with the applicant on the argument that the claims merit allowable subject matter.